Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

XIV.—*PALÆMON AND ARCYTE, PROGNE, MARCUS GEMINUS*, AND THE THEATRE IN WHICH THEY WERE ACTED, AS DESCRIBED BY JOHN BEREBLOCK (1566).

I.

In 1887 Mr. Charles Plummer in his *Elizabethan Oxford*[1] reprinted from various sources several records of Queen Elizabeth's visit to Oxford in 1566. This visit was a great event for town and university, especially since Oxford wished to outdo the welcome which Cambridge had given the Queen on a similar occasion two years before. Consequently the various ceremonies, stage-plays. and disputations of her five days' stay at Oxford were carefully chronicled. The most enthusiastic of the chroniclers was a certain John Bereblock, whose Latin *Commentarii*[2] is a most detailed and valuable record. In the course of this commentary Bereblock makes large and interesting additions to our knowledge of three lost plays, *Marcus Geminus*, the *Palæmon and Arcyte* of Richard Edwards, and the *Progne* of Dr. James Calfhill, all of which were acted during the Queen's visit. He also gives an important description of the manner in which plays were staged at the universities. One need only compare Bereblock's account of *Palæmon and Arcyte* with the commonly quoted account that is found in Anthony á Wood's

---

[1] Oxford Historical Society, Oxford, 1887.

[2] The full title reads as follows: "*Commentarii sivi Ephemeræ Actiones Rerum Illustrum Oxonii Gestarum In Adventu Serenissimæ Principis Elizabethæ.* Ad Amplissimos Viros Dominum Gulielmum Brokum, Dominum de Cobham, et Dominum Gulielmum Petreum, Regium a sanctioribus secretis Consiliarium. Per J. B. Collegii ibidem Exoniensis socium." For an account of Bereblock's life see Plummer, p. xvi.

Athenæ Oxoniensis[1] to see how greatly superior Bereblock's is as a synopsis of the play. The other two plays are of less interest, but Bereblock is the only writer who has handed down to us any summary of them.

His work was first printed by Hearne[2] in 1729; yet valuable as it is, it has been strangely overlooked by students of pre-Shakespearian drama, even since its republication by Mr. Plummer. It has seemed worth while, therefore, to translate those parts of Bereblock's *Commentarii* that deal with the plays and with the "theatre" in which they were presented. Extracts have also been taken from the work of two other chroniclers of the Queen's visit. These two are Nicholas Robinson,[3] who writes in Latin, and Richard Stephens,[4] author of a very brief commentary in English.

---

[1] Edition of 1813, vol. 1, col. 353. A slightly different account printed from Wood's manuscript corrected by Mr. Gough is found in Nichols' *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, London, 1823, vol. i, pp. 210–211 and pp. 212–213.

[2] This and other antiquarian papers were published along with his edition of the *History of the life and reign of Richard II by the Monk of Evesham*, Oxford, 1729. The manuscript had been given Hearne by Thomas Ward, of Warwick, Esq. From Hearne it was reprinted by Nichols in the first edition of the *Progresses*, but was not retained in the edition of 1823.

[3] Robinson, then Bishop of Bangor, was a Cambridge man. He was present at the Queen's visit at Cambridge in 1564, and wrote an account of that also. The Oxford account was first printed by Nichols in his *Progresses*.

[4] Stephens' "Brief Rehearsall of all such Things as were done In The University Of Oxford During The Queen's Majesty's Abode There," was an "Extract Drawn Out Of A Longer Treatise Made by Mr. Neale, Reader of Hebrew At Oxford" (quotations from the title-page). Of Neale's original work there seems to be no trace. Mr. Plummer says (p. xvii, note 3), that in his opinion Neale's work must be practically embodied in Wood's account of this visit in the *History and Antiquities* (Ed. Gutch, ii, pp. 154 ff.), since this account agrees closely and even verbally with that of Stephens; and since the scribe who made the Harleian Copy of the latter omits the report of the Queen's speech to the University, saying it is almost exactly the same as printed in Wood's *Hist. et Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* The "Brief Rehearsall" was first printed by Nichols in his *Progresses*, but was not retained in the second edition.

In comparison with Bereblock it will be seen that they give little or no summary of the plots, though Robinson records some details of authorship, composition, and source not mentioned by the other two. In the last part of the paper I have brought together and discussed a few suggestive points about the plays, and have also spoken of the conditions under which plays were acted in the great halls of the universities, as throwing light on the question of the genesis of the first permanent theatre.

The translations attempt to render the sense of the Latin without smoothing away the extravagances and peculiarities of the style. In places, especially in Bereblock, the meaning is obscure and it may have been guessed wrongly. Bereblock's style, in marked contrast with Robinson's, is inflated and grandiloquent, and this fact must be taken into consideration in judging his comments. He seems to be painstaking, however; and he certainly is copious in his accounts, not only of the plays, but of the disputations and the many other events and arrangements of the Queen's visit. Nothing like his description of the stage conditions is given by either Robinson or Stephens.

II.

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH PLAYS WERE PRESENTED: FROM THE LATIN OF BEREBLOCK.[1]

"At nightfall a most splendid play was presented, which to those who had looked forward to it all day at leisure was a crowning recompense in its brilliance. Nothing, now, more costly or magnificent could be imagined than its staging and arrangement. In the first place there was a remarkable proscenium there, with an approach thrown open from the great solid wall; and from it a hanging wooden bridge, supported also by props, is stretched across to the great hall of the college by means of a small, highly burnished cable running through the cross pieces, the whole being adorned with festal garlands and with an embossed and painted canopy. Through this bridge, without commotion and without contact with the pressing crowd, the Queen might hasten by an easy ascent to the play, when it was ready. The hall was panelled with gilt, and the roof inside was arched and frescoed (*laqueari aurato, et picto arcuatoque introrsus tecto*); in its size and loftiness you would say that it copied after the grandeur of an old Roman palace, and in its magnificence that it imitated some model of antiquity.

---

[1] Hearne, pp. 263–264. Plummer, pp. 123–124.

"In the upper part of the hall, where it looks to the west, a stage is built, large and lofty, and many steps high. Along all the walls balconies and scaffoldings were constructed; these had many tiers of better seats, from which noble men and women might look on, and the people could get a view of the plays from round about. Cressets, lamps, and burning candles made a brilliant light there. With so many lights arranged in branches and circles, and with so many torches, here and there, giving forth a flickering gleam of varying power, the place was resplendent; so that the lights seem to shine like the day and to aid the splendor of the plays by their very great brightness. On each side of the stage magnificent palaces and well equipped houses are built up for the actors in the comedies and for the masked persons (*commœdis ac personatis*). On high a seat had been fixed, adorned with cushions and tapestries and covered with a golden canopy; this was the place made ready for the Queen. But she, indeed, was certainly not present on this night."

MARCUS GEMINUS: FROM THE LATIN OF BEREBLOCK.[1]

[Sunday, Sept. 1, 1566.]

"When, now, everything had been prepared in this fashion, and the house was filled comfortably full, straightway we could see on the stage Geminus Campanus, whom Duillius and Cotta (on account of their hatred and unscrupulous rivalry) accuse before Alexander Severus. Slaves, farmers, and peasants, corrupted by bribes, are introduced as witnesses. Nothing could be more laughable than to observe them, exulting vulgarly in their certain success, now quarreling about the punishment of Geminus, now wrangling over the sharing of his property; and then to see them deploring their (*suum*, his?)[2] bad luck with lamentings and tears like women. When this scene had been sufficiently acted out, freedmen of a more honorable stamp are finally brought forward,—men who could not be induced by threats or rewards to make a wrongful accusation. So by *their* writings, *their* testimony, witness and examination, the conspiracy was made clear. The slaves therefore, formerly accusers, now at the Emperor's command are fixed on the cross, Duillius and Cotta are deservedly punished, the freedmen are rewarded, Geminus is acquitted; and great applause is won from all. When the play is finished, we disperse for the night."

---

[1] Hearne, p. 264. Plummer, pp. 124–125.

[2] If *suum* means *their*, which is the common construction, then this clause anticipates a later part of the action of the play: and the clause "when this scene had been sufficiently acted out," refers only to the accusation of Geminus and the confidence of his accusers. After this the more honorable freedmen were brought in, the accusers were nonplussed, and *then* their lamentations, and deplorings, and tears made a laughable contrast to their previous assurance. By giving *suum* the rarer construction, by which it may be construed to refer, not to the grammatical subject, but to the subject of discourse, *i. e.* Geminus, we get a quite different and more comic situation. According to this interpretation, Duillius and Cotta are *secret* accusers of Geminus. They are wrangling over the division of his property, when he appears, and they suddenly change their note to elaborate, hypocritical sympathizing with him for the bad luck of which they are the secret cause. Then the more honorable witnesses give their testimony, and both the villainy and the hypocrisy of Duillius and Cotta are revealed.

MARCUS GEMINUS: FROM THE LATIN OF ROBINSON.[1]

"This day was closed by a sort of History of a certain Geminus, which History some learned men of Christ's College had turned into the form of a comedy, but in prose; and they acted it on the stage, in the hall of the same college, where all was splendid enough in the way of magnificence and decoration, with regal costliness; and this was done with the aid of Master Edwards, who remained almost two months at the University for completing a certain English work which he gave on the following night. At this historical comedy there were present the Queen's Council, and noble men and women, together with the Ambassador of the Spanish King. The Queen was absent, either because of fear of illness, or because hindered by other business. It had already struck the first hour after midnight when this play was finished."

MARCUS GEMINUS: QUOTED FROM THE ENGLISH ACCOUNT BY STEPHENS.[2]

"This night was played, in the Common Hall of Christ's Church (a fair large scaffold being provided, with lights all of wax, prince-like), a Latin play, named *Marcus Geminus*, at which divers noblemen were present; but the Queen's Majesty came not abroad all this day."

---

[1] Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 235. Plummer, pp. 178–179.

[2] Plummer, p. 199.

PALÆMON AND ARCYTE: FROM THE LATIN OF BEREBLOCK.[1]

First Part.

[Monday, Sept. 2, 1566.]

"At the approach of night, they came together for the play that has been made ready. Its wonderful setting and its lavish elegance had so filled everybody's minds and ears with its marvellous reputation that a mighty and countless crowd of people gathered together, tremendously and immoderately anxious to see. Moreover, the presence of the Queen, of which they had been deprived for two days now, had added such a great desire for it in the minds of all that the number was far greater and more infinite on that account. Scarcely had the Queen come in, together with the nobles and the chief men, and taken her seat on the lofty throne, when all the approaches to the theatre (this was the hall of the college) were thronged with so great crowd, and the steps were already so filled with people, that by their violent pushing they disturbed the common joy by a frightful accident. A certain wall of great square stones had been built there; it was a bulwark propping each side of a pair of steps to bear the rush of the people going up; the crowd becomes too dense, the rush too great, the wall, although quite firm, could not stand the strain; it gives way from the side of the stairs, three men are overwhelmed by the falling mass, as many more wounded. Of those who were overwhelmed the one who survived longest lived not over two days. The wounded, by the application of remedies, soon recovered.

"This untoward happening, although touching every one with sadness, could by no means destroy the enjoyment of the occasion. Accordingly, taught by the misfortune of others to be more careful, all turn again to the play. There one might behold two youthful princes, Arcyte and Palæmon, who had long lived as comrades in their native land, whom a like mortal danger and a common prison had bound together, and whom kinship and a solemn oath had rendered brothers. These two friends fell desperately in love with one and the same maiden, Emilia, sister of the Duke of Athens. Here, then, in the case of these men one might observe that their souls, tossed backward and forward, hither and yon, and scarcely at peace with each other in prison, were disturbed with more furious passion, that they contended, and did battle with each other. Why waste words? They are held in check by their oath, they heed no oath; they are prisoners, they burst forth; they are banished,[1] love forbids long exile; two days is too long, three days is unbearable. The princely youth, therefore, heeding not the penalty of death, returns in meaner garb and calls himself Philostrates instead of Arcyte. He devotes himself to every sort of service, no task too humble for him to perform, nothing so distasteful to his princely nature which by the presence of Emilia does not become sweet and cleanly; without her the most pleasant pursuits are toilsome, hard, and hateful.

---

[1] Hearne, pp. 268–270. Plummer, pp. 127–129.

"Meanwhile Palæmon tricks the guard with a sleeping potion, escapes from his hard imprisonment, flees by night, hiding in the woods during the day, and at length meets his brother. Here their common love for Emilia rouses their strife anew, and it had already caused such tumultuous and passionate reproaches that they were on the point of fighting, but forthwith by the arrival of Theseus the fight is checked. Palæmon then tells who he is, and for what cause they were fighting; nor yet does he beg for his life, although his offence has been serious. The Duke, softened by the prayers of the ladies, who just then happened to come up with him in the hunt, appoints a contest between the princes, and commands them to prepare for battle within fourteen days, promising the maiden as a reward to the victor. It is impossible to tell with what delight and gladness the youths went their way; and we, too, after having all cried out to God for the Queen, departed for the night."

---

[1] The text here has plural verbs (*prohibentur*, *curant*, *incarcerantur*, *erumpunt*, *exulant*), but there is evidently some rhetorical confusion in the passage, for the action can refer only to Arcyte.

Second Part.[1]

[Wednesday, Sept. 4, 1566.]

"The Queen and the nobles are invited to the play, and they accept the invitation. All sat down in their places. Then there was a great silence. Already on the stage the two knights, Arcyte and Palæmon, were ready at the appointed day, each surrounded by a very bold array. On one side was Emetrius, King of India, in whose charge was Arcyte. A hundred soldiers followed him. As many on the other side follow in the train of Thracian Lycurgus, to whose valor, faithfulness, and good fortune Palæmon had entrusted himself. Theseus thought that the battle ought to be decided by a single contest, and that the maiden should be given to him who should win the victory. This arrangement does not displease the kings, nor do the brothers make objection to it.

"Thereupon marble lists are made in the woods, and three very sacred altars are built there, to one of which, that of Diana, Emilia approaches as a suppliant. Here, then, she prays for a maiden life and unbroken chastity, but in her unhappiness she could not make a long entreaty. The goddess predicted marriage. On the other side Arcyte sought victory from him in whose watchful care are warlike virtues. Immediately to him Mars thunders out victory. To Venus at her altar Palæmon makes his prayer for the maiden, and the goddess straightway promises her to him. Here now a quarrel was on foot among the gods. It is Saturn who settles it.

---

[1] Hearne, pp. 281–282. Plummer, pp. 138–139. The representation of *Palæmon and Arcyte* was to have been completed on Tuesday, but was postponed a day. Under Tuesday Bereblock says: "No play was given on this night, because the Queen, delayed by the rather long disputation which preceded it, could not be present at the play without some risk to her health." (Hearne, p. 277; Plummer, pp. 135, 183, 201.)

"Meanwhile each chief looked to the care of the arms for his soldiery, and, that finished, the blast and blare of trumpets is heard. Then in hand to hand conflict they fight fiercely. When at the very first onset the weapons resounded and the shining blades gleamed, a great shudder seized the spectators.[1] For a time success fell to neither contestant, and, wearied with fighting, they twice stop to rest; at the third onset, when not only the movements of their bodies and the parrying of their swords, but even their wounds and blood are visible to everybody, Palæmon sinks to the ground and lies prostrate before his victorious cousin. All joyfully shout their approbation to Arcyte and receive him with gratulations. Palæmon, lifeless and exhausted, having failed of every hope, was none the less tormented still by love, and therefore prays now with loftier eloquence and more fervid supplication, and casts reproaches upon Venus, saying that he had served her from infancy, and that now she had neither desire nor power to help him. Venus could not endure his reproaches, nor could she bear with equanimity to see Mars preferred over her. Womanlike, she pleads her case with lamentations and by weeping. Saturn, stirred by her tears, strikes with subterranean fire the princely victor, as he goes in his triumph crowned splendidly with laurel. Thus Arcyte quickly dies. Then there was a funeral ceremony of great magnificence: he is honored with a public funeral, nobles bear the pall, the kings follow the bier, and the body is burned with solemn pomp. Afterwards at the suggestion of the kings[1] and by the common consent of all, the maiden is given to Palæmon; and this act (the theatre by this time being very full) was approved by the throng with a tremendous shout and clapping of hands. And this was the play that was presented on that night."

---

[1] This and the following sentence are imitated from Livy, Bk. I, ch. XXV.

PALÆMON AND ARCYTE: FROM THE LATIN OF ROBINSON.[2]

First Part.

"As on the previous night, so also on this, the theatre was splendidly adorned, where the *Knight's Tale* (as Chaucer calls it) was publicly exhibited—having been translated from Latin into the English tongue by Master Edwards and some other alumni of the college. After the Queen's Majesty had gone into the theatre, and all the approaches were closed, by some chance or reason a part of a certain wall (by which you go into the theatre) fell, and it overwhelmed a scholar of St. Mary's Hall and a townsman by name of Penny, who were killed on the spot; and also the leg of a certain other scholar was broken, and both legs of the cook were crushed and his face was made almost unrecognizable with the wounds from the falling stones. Nevertheless the play was not stopped, but was continued till midnight."

Second Part.[3]

"On this night what was left of the History or Tale of *Palæmon and Arcyte* was acted, the Queen herself being present at the representation."

---

[1] *Regio consilio.* I take the *regio* to refer to the *two* kings, Emetrius and Lycurgus.

[2] Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 236. Plummer, pp. 179–180.

[3] Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 240. Plummer, p. 185.

PALÆMON AND ARCYTE: QUOTED FROM THE ENGLISH ACCOUNT BY STEPHENS.[1]

First Part.

"This day at night, the Queen heard the first half of an English play called *Palœmon and Arcite*, made by one Mr. Edwards, of her Chappell, and played in the common or great hall at Christ's Church.

"At the beginning of the play there were, by a mischance, three slain; the one a scholer of St. Mary's Hall named Walker, the other a cooke named John Gilbert, and the third a brewer named Mr. Pennie (and more hurt), by the press of the multitude, who thrust down a piece of the side wall of a stair upon them, which the Queen understanding, was very sorry for that mishappe; and then forthwith sent her own surgeons to help them, but by that time they were passt remedy."

Second Part.[2]

"This day, at night, the Queen heard the other half of the forenamed play, *Palœmon and Arcite,* in the Common Hall at Christ's Church; and the same ended, gave Mr. Edwards, the maker thereof, great thanks for his pains."

PROGNE: FROM THE LATIN OF BEREBLOCK.[3]

[Thursday, Sept. 5, 1566.]

"This day was the sixth from the Queen's coming to the city. It gave now the fourth night of our plays in the theatre. On this occasion a very fine and costly entertainment, as the universal wish desired, is rendered with the help of all. On account of its elegance and of the magnificence of the scene, the Queen and the nobles were wonderfully and very exceedingly delighted. The subject of the play is given by Ovid in the sixth book of the *Metamorphoses.* From there, so far as possible, we will report the story.[1] First there is heard distinctly there a sort of subterranean noise, shut in and fearful. Hence from infernal regions Diomedes ascends. That was truly horrible then: he foams at the mouth, he has flaming head, feet, arms, which flame not with a fortuitous, but with innate, deep-seated burning; he himself in truth is only too wretchedly terrified and distracted with the glowing brands of the furies; he is driven to an awful and unspeakable crime; on his proper home forsooth he vomits the venom of his bitterness (*virus acerbitàtis suæ evomere*); he foretells all dire things for the wedding chambers of his grandsons. But that Demon, so hideous, so frightful, so deadly to those about him, the furies do not suffer to stand still very long anywhere; to the lower regions again with great wailings and strugglings as if to some prison-house they force him down. Tereus meanwhile comes home from Athens, and cunningly and craftily reports to his wife Progne the fictitious death of her sister Philomel.

---

[1] Plummer, p. 200.

[2] Plummer, p. 202.

[3] Hearne, pp. 290–293. Plummer, pp. 146–148.

> Lachrimæ fecere fidem, velamina Progne
> Deripit ex humeris, auro fulgentia lato.
> Induiturque atras vestes,
> Et luget non sic lugendæ fata sororis.

For Philomel was not at that time without sensibility and life, but having been forced by violence she had endured the vile lustful outrages of her brother Tereus, a wanton and impure man. Nor yet did the daring man stop at that.

---

[1] In a second MS. (Bodl. Add. A. 63), which Mr. Plummer used in collation with Hearne's text, this sentence is omitted. Bereblock quotes freely from Ovid, patching together verses and parts of verses to form his quotations. These more or less garbled verses I have reprinted just as they stand in Bereblock.

For the fresh lust of passion drove him on to commit another mad crime: for he made sure of her silence with bloody cruelty:

Arreptamque coma, flexis post terga lacertis
Vincla pati cogit.
Luctantemque loqui comprensam forcipe linguam
Abstulit ense ferox.
De scelere hoc possit ne miseranda queri.
Os mutum facti caret indice.
fugam custodia claudit.

"Then she was stoned with stones.[1] There she had instead of bedchambers a stable, instead of supping rooms a prison, instead of a couch a litter of straw.

Grande doloris
Ingenium est, miserisque venit solertia rebus.
Indicium sceleris filis intexuit albis.

Tradidit uni,
Utque ferat Dominæ gestu rogat; illa rogata
Pertulit ad Prognen.
Evolvit vestes sævi matrona tyranni,
Fortunæque suæ carmen miserabile legit,
Et mirum potuisse (silet!) dolor ora repressit.

It is wonderful how she longed to seek vengeance for the blood of her sister. She goes about therefore to avenge wrongs with wrongs, and injuries with injuries; nor is it at all reverent to add crimes to crimes already committed. So first of all she planned a device by which she could get back her sister who had been snatched from her. She feigns the sacrifices of father Bacchus and attended by many Bacchanals

---

[1] This statement is very curious. In none of the many classical versions of the story does any such stoning take place: instead Progne is shut within the stone walls of the stable, as in Ovid, *structa rigent solido stabulorum mœnia saxo* (v. 573). Bereblock's words are *Saxis tum facta ejus lapidatio est*, which can have no other meaning than that the stones were cast upon her (cf. Forcellini's *Lexicon*). *Lapidatio* is probably a slip in Bereblock's latinity, for it seems unlikely that there was a stoning scene in the play.

Venit ad stabula avia tandem,
Exululatque, evoeque sonat, portusque refringit.
Germanamque rapit, raptæque insignia Bacchi
Induit.
Attonitamque trahens, intra sua mœnia ducit,
fletumque sororis
Corripiens, Non est lachrimis hoc, inquit, agendum,
Sed ferro, seu, si quid habes, quod vincere ferrum
Possit, in omne nefas ego me, germana, paravi.
Aut ego cum facibus regalia tecta cremabo,
Aut linguam, aut oculos, aut quæ tibi membra pudorem
Abstulerunt, ferro rapiam, aut per vulnera mille
Sontem animam expellam.
Peragit dum talia Progne,
Ad matrem veniebat Itis. Quid possit ab illo
Admonita est, oculisque tuens immitibus, ah! quam
Es similis patri, dixit, nec plura loquuta,
Triste parat facinus.
Mater Itin puerum, visu miserabile! mactat,
Apponitque fero viscera cocta patri.
Ipse sedens solio Tereus sublimis avito,
Vescitur, inque suam sua viscera congerit alvum.
Vescenti Philomela caput cervice resectum
Misit in ora patris, nec tempore maluit ullo
Posse loqui.
Thracius ingenti mensas clamore repellit,
Et sequitur nudo genitas Pandione ferro.

And that play was a notable portrayal of mankind in its evil deeds, and was for the spectators, as it were, a clear moral of all those who indulge too much either in love or in wrath, each of which even if they come to fairly good men nevertheless inflame them with too strong desire, and make them far fiercer and more ungovernable, and very different in voice, countenance, spirit, in word, and deed, from moderation and self-control. At the end of the play, when now the people with mighty assent had given their applause and approbation in the name of the Queen, they turn hastily homeward."

PROGNE: FROM THE LATIN OF ROBINSON.[1]

"Afterwards the Queen's Majesty is led into the Hall, where the wax candles had been lighted, because eight o'clock had already struck. In the silence of this night there is exhibited on the stage how King Tereus devours his son, slain and prepared by his wife Progne on account of her outraged sister,—all indeed exactly as it should be, with great magnificence, and splendor truly regal. When this Tragedy received its applause, we retire for the night."

PROGNE: QUOTED FROM THE ENGLISH ACCOUNT BY STEPHENS.[2]

"This day, at night, was played in the Common Hall at Christ's Church a Tragedy in Latin named *Progne.*"

III.

MARCUS GEMINUS.

Bereblock's summary of the play *Marcus Geminus* is the only one preserved to us. The play was no doubt of slight importance. Written in Latin, composed by scholars, it was merely one of the many plays that constitute the school, or educational, drama in England.

The *history* of the title character, Geminus, is doubtful. What foundation there is for it I have not yet been able to find. Robinson speaks of the play as based on "a sort of History of a certain Geminus" (*historia quædam Gemini cujusdam*), a statement which suggests the doubtful place of Geminus in history. This "History"—true, legendary, or imagined—was "turned into a comedy," and furnishes one more example of the practice, common even in the first years of Elizabeth, of making plays from previous plays or narratives. *Marcus Geminus,* moreover, is one of the early comedies in prose (*Comœdiæ, sed oratione soluta*). The *sed* indicates the unusualness of a prose comedy. Gascoigne in the same year was making the first important contribution to the prose drama in his *Supposes.*

---

[1] Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 244. Plummer, p. 189.

[2] Plummer, p. 203.

Just how much help Richard Edwards gave toward the production of *Geminus* is not quite clear from Robinson's statement, but the order of phrasing perhaps justifies the assumption that his assistance was in staging rather than composing it.

PALÆMON AND ARCYTE.

Palæmon and Arcyte, the last and best work of Richard Edwards (1523–1566), is thoroughly summarized by Bereblock. It may fairly be ranked as a romantic play, showing the rising Italian influence in English drama. In this it reminds one of the later romantic comedies of Lyly. To be sure, its characters and its scene are drawn from classical realms (like Lyly again); but the play is based on Chaucer's *Knight's Tale,* which goes back to the *Teseide* of Boccaccio, and the story is distinctly a story of romantic love, as the author's happily extant *Damon and Pythias* is a story of romantic friendship.

In connection with the source which Edwards used, a startling query is suggested by the statement of Robinson translated above. Robinson speaks of the play as "the *Knight's Tale* (as Chancer calls it)—translated from Latin into the English tongue by Master Edwards, and some other alumni of the college." If this statement be literally true, there are two consequences: first, Edwards must be shorn of the credit, his by all other contemporary notices, of the authorship of a play which enjoyed unusual popularity;

secondly, the existence of a hitherto unknown Latin version of the Palæmon and Arcyte story must be assumed. This Latin version might have been a pre-Chaucerian romance, which is most unlikely; or a post-Chaucerian translation of the *Knight's Tale* into Latin; or more probably a Latin dramatization of Chaucer's poem belonging to the period from 1520–1540; for, if not in dramatic form, the word *translated* could not have been strictly used by Robinson.

These are the consequences, if we accept Robinson's statement. It is easier for me, personally, to believe that Robinson's words are the result of his confusing *Palœmon and Arcyte* with the Latin play *Marcus Geminus*, which was "turned into the form of a comedy" by certain learned men of Christ's College, with the help of Edwards. Yet the manuscript of a Latin play entitled *Fabula Militis* or *Palœmon et Arcita* may some day be discovered.

Of more present importance than the question of the source used by Edwards, is the question of his work as itself a possible source of a notable play of the Jacobean period. What is its relation to *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, a dramatization of the same story? The various editors of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*,[1] depending for their knowledge of *Palœmon and Arcyte* upon the frequently quoted but very slender account of it given in Anthony á Wood's *Athenœ Oxoniensis*,[2] have asserted that Edwards's play was not a source. As a matter of fact, Wood's account gives so little of the real substance of the play that from it nothing can be concluded either way. From Bereblock's full summary, however, it is possible to *prove*, as far as such things can be proved, that *Palæmon and Arcyte* was not a source of *The Two Noble Kinsmen.*

---

[1] Littledale, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, edited for the New Shakespeare Society, London, 1885, introd., pp. 9–11; Rolfe, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, New York, 1883, introd., pp. 24–25; and others.

[2] Edition of 1813, vol. i, col. 353.

I have already discussed this subject in another paper (*Journal of Germanic Philology*, vol. iv, no. 3), where the argument may be found in full. Most of Bereblock's account of *Palæmon and Arcyte* has already been translated there.

Other matters connected with the play—its relation to early romantic comedy in England, its allegorical significance, its part in the influence of Edwards on Lyly—I must reserve for discussion in a later paper on Richard Edwards.

PROGNE.

The author of *Progne* was Dr. James Calfhill, whose life is briefly told by Nichols.[1] Calfhill's play is a dramatization of the old story of Procne, Tereus, and Philomela, which is related by many classical writers, but by Ovid[2] with most detail. From Ovid Bereblock quotes freely in his report,—so freely, that it is doubtful whether his account of some points is based on the play or on the poem, much of the action being set forth in Ovid's verses.

It would naturally be supposed from Bereblock's statement that Calfhill used Ovid directly as his source. But it is entirely possible that he simply adapted a dramatic version that already existed. I discover that such a version did exist, and is now extant, though unfortunately inaccessible to me. Brunet in his *Manuel du Libraire* cites the following books: (no. 16159) "*Progne*, tragœdia. *In* Academia Veneta, 1558, in-4;" and (no. 16677) "La Progne, tragedia di Lod. Domenichi. Fierenze, Giunti, 1561, in-8." The 1558 *Progne* is a Latin play, and the 1561 *La Progne*, of course, an Italian one (there was also a *La Progne* by Girolamo Parabosco, published in 1547, and an unpublished tragedy of that title written by Allessandro Spinello, at Venice in 1549).[1] The Latin play of 1558 was written in 1464 by Gregorio Corraro, and from it, as Zeno shows, Domenichi took his *La Progne* of 1561.[2] Corraro's play was printed again in the 17th century, and yet, in spite of its being fairly well known, a Dutch writer named Heerkens, finding a copy, tried to palm it on the scholarly world as an antique, the work of Lucius Varius, the Augustan tragedian. Heerkens announced his "discovery" in the introduction to his book of Latin verse entitled *Icones* (1787), where he quoted long passages from the play (to which he gave the title *Tereus*), together with the prologue entire. He intended to edit his *Tereus* showily, but scholars became suspicious and the imposture was brought to light.[3]

---

[1] "James Calfhill of Shropshire. Admitted at Oxford 1545; student of Ch. Ch. 1548; A. M. 1552; second canon of Ch. Ch. 1560; D. D. of Bocking and Archdeacon of Colchester, and nominated to Worcester 1570 but died before consecration. *Ath. Ox.* C. 163." Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 230.

[2] *Metamorphoses*, VI, 412–674 (Teubner text).

I am not now able to lay hands on a copy of *Icones*, and must leave the investigation of Calfhill's indebtedness to Corraro to a more fortunate time; but since Corraro's prologue, as printed by Heerkens, introduces the character of Diomedes,[4] as Calfhill's did (a character not mentioned by

---

[1] Fontanini's *Biblioteca dell' Eloquenza Italiana*, with Zeno's annotations, Parma, 1803. Tome i, p. 513, and Zeno's note (a).

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 513–14. Zeno's note (b).

[3] For a clear statement of the facts of this curious literary incident, v. *Lucius Varius et Cassius Parmensis*, Aug. Weichert, 1836, pp. 118–120; *Operette di Iacopo Morelli*, Venezia, 1820, vol. ii, pp. 211–217; Brunet's bibliographical note under *Progne.* The exposure of Heerkens was made by David Christian Grimm in an essay, *Tragœdia vetus latina* Tereus *deperditarum XV soror*, Annabergæ, 1790, and by Morelli in a letter of 1792, the reference for which is given just above.

[4] Diomedes, King of Thrace, is not elsewhere mentioned as an ancestor of Tereus, but the relationship was naturally assumed, and must have been easily understood by the cultured audience.

Ovid[1]), there is every reason to suspect a close relationship between the plays.

It is possible that Calfhill, following the dramatic vogue of the day, turned the prologue borrowed from Corraro into a dumb show. Certainly this part of the play might have been easily presented in pantomine, and the action as narrated above by Bereblock bears a curious likeness to the dumb show before the fourth act of *Gorboduc*. *Gorboduc* had been acted before the Queen in 1561, and the pirated edition was printed in 1565, only the year before *Progne* was produced. "The Order and Signification of the Domme Shew before the Fourth Act" is stated in these words:

> "First the musick of howboies began to plaie, during which there came from vnder the stage, as though out of hell, three Furies, Alecto, Megera, and Ctesiphone, clad in black garmentes sprinkled with bloud and flames, their bodies girt with snakes, their heds spred with serpentes in-stead of heare; the one bearing in her hand a snake, the other a whip, and the third a burning firebrand; ech driuing before them a king and a queene, which, moued by furies, vnnaturally had slaine their owne children: the names of the kings and queenes were these, Tantalus, Medea, Athamas, Ino, Cambises, Althea. After that the Furies and these had passed about the stage thrise, they departed; and than the musick ceased. Hereby was signified the vnnaturall murders to follow, that is to say, Porrex slaine by his owne mother, and of King Gorboduc and Queene Viden, killed by their owne subiectes." [2]

The similarity of this to the torment of Diomedes and to the "signification" of his torment is obvious. The dumb show in *Progne*, then,—if we are safe in calling it a dumb show,—may have been suggested by *Gorboduc;* and at any rate served to modernize the play and bring it into line with the well defined vogue of dumb shows, examples of which are found in *Jocasta* (1566), and *Tancred and Gismunda* (1568), as well as in *Gorboduc.*

---

[1] The only suggestion in Ovid for the whole scene of Diomedes and the furies is in the following passage:

> "Eumenides tenuere faces de funere raptas;
> Eumenides stravere torum, tectoque profanus
> Incubuit bubo thalamique in culmine sedit.
> Hac ave coniuncti Progne Tereusque, parentes
> Hac ave sunt facti." (VI, 430–434.)

[2] Manly, *Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, vol. ii, p. 246.

Without access to either Corraro's *Progne* or Heerkens' extracts from it, I cannot furnish any positive evidence that Calfhill made use of the Italian author's play; but a bit of negative testimony, to help show that he did not dramatize directly from Ovid, may be added. In Ovid no moral is drawn, but Bereblock's last paragraph shows that here the lesson of the story was not unappreciated. While the moralizing may be Bereblock's own, there may have been at the end of the play a speech exploiting the lesson. This speech may have had no counterpart in Corraro, but was possibly modelled (like the dumb show) after a fashion of the time. For moralizing is put into the mouth of Eubulus at the end of *Gorboduc*, and of Edwards's Eubulus at the end of *Damon and Pythias.* Gascoigne gives a somewhat similar treatment of the moral of the same story in his *Complaint of Phylomene* (1576–7), a poem which shows a contemporary interest in the theme. These moralizing speeches, no doubt, show the influence of the morality plays even upon those authors who were breaking the pathway to the new dramatic field.

THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH PLAYS WERE PRESENTED.

Mr. Ordish in his *Early London Theatres* discusses the influence that the early conditions under which plays were acted had upon the form and construction of the Theatre and Curtain of 1576. Though he develops an argument for the influence of the amphitheatre of ancient England in determining the circular configuration of these first London playhouses, he goes on to show that the innyards were the *immediate* predecessors of the early theatres. This idea of the form of the playhouse being an adaptation of the conditions of the innyard is the commonly accepted one. Yet Mr. Ordish adds that there may have been other influences at work, of which we have now lost sight. "Nor is it known," he says, "under what stage arrangements the player acted when at home; *i. e.*, at a royal palace or the residence of the master whose servants they were. It is probable that the courtyard was the usual theatre; but we do not know, and these conditions probably told upon the arrangements of the playhouse as much as did the formation in the innyards." [1]

The narrative of Bereblock gives us just the information necessary to understand how plays were presented before royalty and nobility in the great halls, and we can see how such conditions as are described must have influenced the plans of the players and managers who ventured the erection of the first playhouse.

In the yards of the inns, where a play was to be given, a platform was built out from one side for a stage; the rooms behind it were used for dressing rooms and the balcony of the stage; the balconies on the other three sides served for the nobler spectators, while the groundlings held the courtyard itself. From Bereblock we learn that essentially the same conditions obtained at the magnificent production at Oxford. The problem was the same: a play was to be presented; and a rectangular space was available for it. Accordingly, at one end of the hall "the stage was built large and lofty, and many steps high. Along all the walls balconies and scaffoldings were constructed; these had many tiers of better seats, from which noble men and women might look on, and the people could get a view of the plays all round about." There is thus a close similarity between the main features of the temporary playhouse here and at the inns.[1] It is *not* to be assumed, however, that the preparations for a play in a great hall (as this at Oxford) were in any way imitated from the contrivances of the players in the innyards. The very opposite is more likely.

---

[1] P. 28.

For what suggested to the common players the idea of using the courts of the inns for their theatre? When plays were still being presented on pageant wagons in the towns, the nobles and the court were entertained by dramatic performances in the halls of the castles and palaces. It is evident that on such occasions special provision must have been made, so that as many as possible could see. In a square or rectangular hall the most obvious and easy thing for this purpose was to build scaffoldings or balconies along the walls, as Bereblock reports was done at Oxford. Now when the companies of players which acted at the great halls looked about for a way to present their plays in public; the square courtyard of the inn at once suggested itself as offering the essential features of the great hall. A platform only need be erected; the rooms of the inn with their balconies were adaptable for spectators in place of the balconies with tiers of seats rising above one another, and except for the absence of a roof the place was a fair substitute for the theatres of the nobility. It is, then, entirely credible that the notion of using the innyards for plays was derived from the previous experience of the actors in the great halls.

---

[1] Somewhat different arrangements were made for the presentation of the *Aulularia* at Cambridge, 1564, "For the hearing and playing whereof, was made, by her Highness surveyor and at her own cost, in the body of the [King's College] Church, a great stage containing the breadth of the Church from the one side to the other, that the Chappels might serve for Houses. In the length it ran two of the lower Chappels full, with the pillars on a side. Upon the south wall was hanged a cloth of State, with the appurtenances and half-path for her Majesty.

In the rood-loft another stage for Ladies and Gentlewomen to stand on. And the two lower tables, under the said rood-loft, were greatly enlarged and rayled for the choyce officers of the Court.

There was, before her Majesty's coming, made in the King's College Hall, a great stage. But because it was judged by divers to be too little, and too close for her Highness and her company, and also for her lodging, it was taken down." Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 166.

In the plan of the Christmas festivities of the Temple in 1561–2 we have the following statement, which describes a theatre more nearly like that described by Bereblock: "*The Banquetting Night.* It is proper to the Butler's office, to give warning to every House of Court of this banquet; to the end that they, and the Innes of Chancery, be invited thereto, to see a play and mask. The Hall is to be furnished with scaffolds to sit on, for Ladies to behold the sports, on each side." Nichols, 2d ed., vol. i, p. 141.

This view suggests at once that just as the manner of dramatic presentations before the nobles and the court led to the use of the innyards for a substitute, so the conditions in the great halls must have partly furnished the model for the first permanent public theatre—the Theatre of 1576.

This view has greater weight from the fact that the drama of England during the early years of Elizabeth's reign was coming more and more under the patronage of the schools, the nobles, and the court. So far as we know, almost every significant play between 1558 and 1576 was enacted under the auspices of the universities or the court.[1] Burbage and his company, who established the Theatre and played in it, were the Earl of Leicester's men; thus those who planned and built the first playhouse were undoubtedly quite as familiar with the conditions at the castles and palaces as with those at the Talbot, or Boar's Head, or the other inns. In setting about the construction of a permanent building for plays they naturally did not neglect to consider suggestions from the best temporary theatres England afforded—those of the palaces and universities. In playing at the inns they had had to take things as they found them; they could not have afforded, nor would they have been allowed by the innkeepers, to build up such arrangements as were possible to the wealthy and great. In putting up a permanent structure, however, they naturally combined the best features of both these kinds of improvised theatres,—the balcony with many tiers of seats from the palace hall, and the additional second balcony suggestrd by the two or three stories of the inn. The innyard, open to the air above, no doubt taught that the theatre could be less expensively built without a roof and still give the crowd in the pit as much comfort as it was accustomed to; while the balconies modelled after those of the halls were more commodious and convenient to see from than those of the inns. Thus every main feature of the early playhouse can be traced to the conditions either of the hall or the innyard. If we assume, as has hitherto been done, that the Theatre was a development from the innyard alone, it must be granted that Burbage made notable improvements on his model; but when we conceive this double origin of the Theatre, it is at once seen that it was merely the embodiment in permanent form of things already familiar. Even the curved or octagonal form of the Theatre, which has been pointed to as a great advance over the square innyard, may very well have been borrowed from the shape of the balconies used in the great halls. Why should *they* not have been curved or cut off at the corners? Why should the credit for the idea (which is after all a very obvious one) of rounding off the inconvenient corners be given to James Burbage rather than to some one of the nameless carpenters at the court who for years had been facing the same problem of how to make a theatre out of a rectangular space? At any rate, the conditions which prevailed at the dramatic performances of the universities and the court can no longer be overlooked in seeking the genesis of the public theatre. They must be granted to be an equal if not a dominant influence in its development.

---

[1] It is sufficient to mention *Ferrex and Porrex* at the Inner Temple, *Apius and Virginia* by Westminster scholars, *Julius Sesyar* (?) at Court, *Jocasta* at Gray's Inn, *Damon and Pythias* at Westminster, *Palæmon and Arcyte* at Oxford, *Roister Doister* by school boys, *Gammer Gurton's Needle* at Cambridge, *Supposes* at Gray's Inn.

W. Y. Durand.